

## **Panel 1 Discussion**

MR. PYNE: Thank you. Thank you, Jeff. We're going to take a few minutes for questions. Tom, we're going to just steal maybe ten, fifteen minutes if we could. So we'll entertain questions or comments to the panel. If you would please state your name.

MS. JOHNNCK: Yes, I'm Ellen Johnck. I'm Executive Director of the San Francisco Bay Planning Coalition, San Francisco, California representing maritime interests in the bay.

I'm very interested in Anatoly's challenge on looking at the approach to the environment, comparing Europe to the United States and environmental issues on waterways. And particularly I'd like some comments from the panelists on the validity of Anatoly's statement, thinking that it seems as if there is more acceptability of the waterways and looking at development on waterways as not degrading of the waterways, but there's more acceptability of development there and less offense on the environment.

Whereas, in the United States there is a very anti-development approach and attitude on the waterways. And everything we do on the waterways is anti-environment. We're always trying to defend and get ahead of that curve. So, number one some comments on that idea.

Then secondarily I am interested in knowing what the approaches are to handling environmental issues on waterway projects. Particularly, we seem to be very much on a sound science approach in the United States looking at how we can better defend our activities on the waterways showing we really don't have as adverse an affect as some people think, and that we are trying to develop better sound science on impacts on the fish, et cetera.

The other approach is to look at more of an environmental risk, showing the environmental effects, you know, overall. For instance, if we are in effect reducing congestion on highways and air pollution mitigation there.

Sort of different approaches and the way to help us deal with the environment and further improving our efforts to elevate the importance of the waterways, and what we can do to be successful on them. Thank you.

MR. PYNE: Yes, thank you for those questions. I think with respect to the second question, that's a better question to pose to the second panel that's going to address environmental issues. But with respect to the first, the Anatoly challenge, who would like to start?

MS. DE SCHEPPER: So for environmental, waterway development, and environmental effects what we have here is a very diverse analysis of the situation.

For example, in a typical waterborne country like the Netherlands or Belgium, you don't have a negative approach to waterway development. The negative approach is seen in other countries where they are not used to big waterway development projects.

And there what we clearly need to do is to communicate and also to coordinate more together. So, first to communicate, to say what we are doing and what kind of impact it has because now we are reactive. So that's as well happening in Europe.

Also, we have to coordinate because everyone is doing something in its national

member state and even in its region. And that is very important that we sit together and learn with each other. And we see, for example, that where British waterways has been working with the World Wildlife Fund, they have been very successful. So, these kinds of measures of working together, opening the dialogue with the environmental groups is very important as we see it. Thank you.

MR. HIGH: May I just say. From the U.S. perspective obviously we've included the environmental stakeholders as much as we can in our MTS efforts. That's very difficult because they are very diverse encompassing many, many different views. So, we're working with them, and we're trying to figure out a way to get their views more implemented. And EPA is a strong member of our team by the way, so they're trying to help us with that.

I'll just give you a little anecdote. Here's part of the problem we have. I was talking about the benefits, the air emission benefits that Anatoly was talking about of the marine mode.

And one of my colleagues who is I would say a highway background person said, oh, no, but you ought to see the report that was done by the Transportation System Center. I haven't seen it yet.

But the way he related to me was it says that marine diesel is much worse than highway traffic. And, in fact, there is no benefit. I was flabbergasted.

But the point is there's a perception out there that it isn't as wonderful as you think. So, we've got to get our hands on those reports. We've got to defeat those kinds of comments, and we've got to do studies ourselves to be able to show that we have the benefits that we claim.

MS. BAUTCH: I'd like to ride in on what Jeff had to say, and the fact that we tried to include the environmental organizations in the National Advisory Council.

But additionally MARAD has always been very, very supportive of the inland waterway system. And several years ago we did develop an excellent brochure talking about the environmental advantages of inland waterway transportation.

So, if you'd like to download it, you can get it on our web site, [www.MARAD.Dot.gov](http://www.MARAD.Dot.gov). And that will help you as you go out and you continue to talk about the environmental advantages of inland waterway transport, you have some statistics there. You have a nice brochure that explains, and you can use it as you get to

talk to others. Thank you.

DR. HOCHSTEIN: Let me just hit at that. I think the situation is that we have attacked the situation with an expedient approach. On one hand it's very clear that we are the most friendly to the environment. On the other hand, we see that we have huge opposition from the mainstream environmental groups.

And I think, and that by the way goes for both continents, the same situation. Therefore, we need to really understand the roots of this huge misunderstanding and possibly counterattack it by creating environmental groups who work with us who may deliver our message in more environmental circles. And I think that the MTS does a lot to bring it in, of course, working with the EPA.

MR. PYNE: Is there another question?

MR. RUSSO: My name is Edmond Russo. I work in the New Orleans District Corps of Engineers. I just wanted to give you a perspective. I'm an operations manager of several shallow and deep draft projects in the New Orleans area. I also worked in planning and project management and have sort of looked at this issue some.

It seems that this is a foremost subject in the transportation industry. There needs to be a national study done to examine the market trends and see where the traffic needs to go; what types of traffic and where it needs to go in the United States.

Look at what our existing capacities are and where the bottlenecks are with regard to water side and land side connections and focus our studies programmatically with environmental impact assessments to authorize and fund projects for this kind of development.

This is probably one of the only ways that we're going to see meaningful and comprehensive progress on a noticeable time scale. It seems that, when you're working at the district level, maybe you don't see some of these things.

But perhaps that type of thing would be advantageous, especially to get everybody from the policy makers to the project executioners. That's the Corps of Engineers when it comes to water resources and development projects.

They all need to come together to make this happen. Right now it sort of seems splintered, and this would really help to really get the process going.

MR. PYNE: Thank you. Thank you for that comment. Does the panel want to respond to the need for a study?

MS. DE SCHEPPER: I could perhaps comment on that. I just wanted to say that you are very right. We have the same problem in the European Union. We don't have a very clear study, which is picturing the transport flows across the European Union. We have port of water flows. We have some from company to company, but really door to door flows overall Europe we don't have. And so if you want to build up any efficient infrastructure, the appropriate infrastructure where your priorities are, this is very important. We've been asking for this quite some years, and we always get kind of a part of the study we want, but we don't get the overall picture.

So I don't know how it is in the U.S., but we are also asking that research money is well spent for clear projects, and not money to this and money to that and to all kinds of little projects because you are very right. Thank you.

MR. PYNE: Do we have time for another question? Tom, do we have a little more time or -- one more question.

MR. BRUIN: My name is Dick Bruin. I'm from the Netherlands. I work at the

Ministry of Public Works and Transport. I'm a river engineer. I did a lot of advisory work abroad on inland navigation. And I worked at the World Bank, in particular in a program on inland navigation and the environment.

And with that background, I want to make a remark and maybe a question. I enjoyed the presentations this morning, but I missed one crucial issue and that is maintenance. If you want to prove that a business is flourishing, then you must maintain that business.

So if you have infrastructure in this case, you're talking about inland navigation infrastructure. And if you want to prove that it works, then you have to maintain that system.

Now, in my organization in Holland, we spend more than 55 even 60 percent of the annual budget on maintenance. I'm not talking about new capital investments. I'm just talking about maintenance. And that is for let's say the maintenance of structures, but also the waterways, alignments, and so on. Of course, maintenance dredging also. And I missed also the maintenance aspect in the presentation from Brussels. Maybe you can say something about that because in my opinion it's mainly a matter of the member states, the maintenance of infrastructure, but you really have to work on that. If you don't maintain your business, then it will not succeed. And the time I lived in the United States in Washington, I traveled a lot also here in your beautiful country. But again and again as a European, I'm flabbergasted when I see the neglect of your infrastructure, and this is a crucial point. Maybe you can say something about that.

MR. PYNE: Thank you. Let's see. Was there a message that we didn't respond to the maintenance issue?

MR. HIGH: I'll respond to that. Clearly maintenance is part of the needs that we have identified. Obviously the Corps of Engineers is very good at understanding what needs to be done in terms of locks and dams in our waterways and so forth. I just didn't get into the details.

And as we determine our assessment of our needs for the future, what we need to do is make sure that that is one of the things that gets down on our list. Clearly it's important, and I agree with you a hundred percent.

MS. BAUTCH: What I had indicated and again perhaps just glossed over it is the fact that we do have a legislative working group in the National Advisory Council. And we are looking at the uses of the harbor maintenance fee and the inland waterway user fees, and how those monies can be redirected for their purposes.

And one of those purposes is the maintenance of the channels and the locks and dams. And the Corps, of course, does an excellent job of that. But we are looking at that, and we will be making recommendations or the council will be making recommendations to the Secretary of Transportation as to how those funds can be re-allocated for the purposes for which they were established.

MR. PYNE: Thank you, Doris. Now, we're going to take one more.

MS. CAMBRIDGE: Joedy Cambridge, TRB and the Marine Board. Anatoly, I just had a response to the point that Mr. Russo made. I think we've done a lot of studies on the issues of capacity and where the bottlenecks are and where the greatest needs are.

One example is a TRB study that's about to be finished looking at freight capacity in the 21st century across all modes. That should be finished fairly soon.

The study being done for the chamber is looking at some of these issues. And there has been a lot of effort done within the Federal Highway Administration under TEA-21 studies, including the intermodal connector study.

I think the frustration is that these bottlenecks and these issues have been identified and nothing has been done to correct them. And I think that's where the problem is.

I don't think we need a lot more studies on where the big constraints are. We just need now to have the funding to do something about it. And I think that's true across all modes.

MR. PYNE: Well, thank you for that comment. We're going to end with that comment.

